

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

AIDAVEL LOZANO LAIGO,

Plaintiff,

v.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C05-0728C

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's response to the Court's Order to Show Cause (Dkt. Nos. 5 & 6). Having reviewed the materials submitted by Plaintiff and being fully informed, the Court hereby finds and rules as follows:

On February 25, 2005, Plaintiff filed a complaint against the Social Security Administration alleging that the agency violated "the privacy act" and discriminated against her when an agency representative asked for her Social Security number in response to a phone inquiry placed by Plaintiff to the agency. This complaint, assigned case number C05-0318C, was dismissed without prejudice on March 17, 2005, for failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), which requires a complaint to contain a *plain* statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.

Plaintiff filed another action on March 28, 2005. From what the Court could piece together of the

1 complaint, this action asserted a cause of action similar to the previously dismissed complaint, except that
2 it concerns a different discrete occasion. On April 4, 2005, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause
3 why the new complaint should not be dismissed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim
4 upon which relief can be granted or for failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). In response to the
5 show cause order, Plaintiff submitted a "rebuttal to order" stating that

6 Plaintiff submits she will not attend the ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE because facts filed to
7 this court are truth, whole truth and nothing but the truth . . . Plaintiff submits she will
8 not file an amended complaint because the issue she filed which is discrimination is very
9 clear for violating her right, as clear as crystal water.

10 The Court construed this statement as a refusal to comply with the Court's order to show cause.

11 On April 18, 2005, Plaintiff filed yet another complaint, almost identical to the two discussed
12 above. Again, the Court issued a show cause order (Dkt. No. 2), in response to which Plaintiff submitted
13 papers substantially identical to her responses to the show cause orders in the previous actions. As in her
14 previous actions, her responses to the show cause order in this action are insufficient to show cause why
15 the action should not be dismissed.

16 For this reason, the Court hereby DISMISSES Plaintiff's complaint.

17 SO ORDERED this 17th day of May, 2005.

18 
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26